

involvement in the area would not be as bad or worse than the damage to be done by Appalachian Power Company's proposed power plant.

It is felt that inclusion of the New River in the protective province of the federal system would be the salvation, rather than the ruin, of the New River Valley, and I will do my best, working in conjunction with Senators Ervin and Helms, to see this bill passed by the Congress.

I have also filed exception with the Federal Power Commission to a recommendation by an FPC administrative law judge that the Blue Ridge project be licensed. With the filing of this exception, the FPC is thus compelled to render its own decision in the case, rather than simply ratifying the administrative judge's recommendation. I have also filed a motion for oral arguments before the Commission, to allow me and other opponents of the project to plead our case, directly and personally, to the Commission before it hands down its final decision.

DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

Last November, when the Congress was considering whether to impose daylight savings time on a year-round basis, I made a speech on the House floor in opposition to the bill.

As I said then, the imposition of daylight savings time presents us with two options. We can send our children to school in the cold and the dark of early morning, with the darkness increasing the likelihood of bus accidents and pedestrian crossing accidents, and with the cold requiring a greater expenditure of heating oil than is now required.

Or we can send our children to school an hour later, and let them join their parents in the perils of rush hour traffic, a hazard that all of us would like to avoid for ourselves, much less for our children.

My colleagues in the Congress passed the bill anyway, and we have since read of just those problems coming to light in several cities, including those in North Carolina.

I continue to oppose daylight savings time, and a bill has now been introduced in both the House and Senate to repeal it.

VETERAN'S BENEFITS

The House of Representatives recently passed legislation to increase and expand education and rehabilitation allowances for veterans, with special emphasis on meeting the needs of the Vietnam era veteran.

The bill increases educational assistance allowances under all veterans' education programs by 13.6 percent and extends the time during which veterans must complete training for two years. These rates were last increased in September of 1972, when an average increase of 25.7 percent was granted. I strongly supported both bills.

As I said in a speech to the House during debate on this bill, and as I have said many times before, the debt this nation owes to its armed service veterans is one we can never fully repay, but by providing our veterans with the services and special assistance they need and deserve, we can pay tribute to the great service they have given their country.

Also, I have again sponsored in the House a resolution to redesignate November 11 as the official date for observance of Veterans Day.

I was not a Member of Congress when the so-called Monday Holiday Act was passed. However, I believe this Congress needs to correct the mistake of making a national observance of such historical significance and meaning into nothing more than the third day of a three-day weekend.

HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Last September I introduced legislation to guarantee that North Carolina receive a minimum of 80 cents' return for every tax dollar the State contributes to the Highway Trust Fund.

In 1972, North Carolina ranked next to

last among the 50 States with a return of 50 cents per dollar for highway projects in the state.

This low rate of return is the result of a gross inequity which presently exists in the formula for state donations to the Highway Trust Fund. I intend to change that formula to give North Carolina a fairer share of highway money.

With the passage of my bill, North Carolina would automatically receive an increase in federal highway money of more than 25-million over the present \$95-million allocation.

I believe this bill will be particularly helpful to our area in need of better transportation routes, and I am convinced that North Carolina deserves a fairer return on its investment in the Highway Trust Fund than it is presently getting.

THE HONORABLE BARBARA JORDAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to our fellow Members that I had the pleasure of introducing the Speaker of the House of Representatives at a dinner in Houston, Tex., honoring a most capable Texan, the Honorable BARBARA JORDAN, on Saturday, March 30, 1974.

Ms. JORDAN represents the 18th District of Texas and her friends and colleagues showed their respect for her capable representation.

I hope you, my fellow Members, and the general public will find the following article about Ms. JORDAN from the Christian Science Monitor interesting.

The article follows:

IMPACT IN CONGRESS

(Freshman Congresswoman BARBARA JORDAN sits on the House of Representatives' Judiciary Committee "... engaged in the most important proceeding ever to occur in our lifetimes. . . .")

(By Jo Ann Levine)

WASHINGTON.—A Texas woman known for her awesome equilibrium sits on the committee which must decide whether or not to recommend the impeachment of the President of the United States.

During a recent meeting of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, Rep. Barbara C. Jordan (D) leaned back in her chair as she listened to both the majority and minority counsels discuss whether or not the President should be issued with a subpoena.

At this time in history, the Democratic freshman congresswoman from the 18th district (Houston) views her own role with seriousness. Back in her office, in an authoritative alto voice, she said:

"I feel, and I think my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee feel, that we are engaged in the most important proceeding ever to occur in our lifetimes in terms of what the result could mean for more than 200 million people. It is the people who are involved, the country which is involved, the state of the Union which is involved, our relations with other nations which are involved. The economy reverberates with every move which is made—if that move relates specifically to the President.

POINT OF DETERMINATION

"We are not overwhelmed by our task, but we are very sober about our task. And

the Judiciary Committee, having received authority from the House of Representatives to pursue this impeachment investigation with all of the tools and financing necessary to do a thorough job (a 101-member staff has been hired) is determined that this proceeding will not suffer the fate of the Andrew Johnson proceeding of more than 100 years ago.

"That proceeding has been attacked by historians, politicians, and constitutional lawyers as being so enmeshed in political partisanship, and emotionalism, that the members seemed not to be aware of the seriousness of their task and the implications. We are determined to do a job that is defensible—not only by those who agree with our conclusions, but by people who disagree.

"We cannot afford partisanship. . . . There are 38 lawyers on this committee. Every member is a lawyer, and the approach is a very lawyer-like, legal-like approach."

In the crackerbox-shaped committee room, these 38 lawyers sit in two tiers above the witnesses, the press, and the public, against a background of heavy green velvet curtains. To the far left of chairman Peter Rodino (D) of New Jersey is Representative Jordan's desk. "Ms. Jordan" says her nameplate. The only other "Ms." nameplate belongs to Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman (D) of New York.

Known for her methodical hard work, Representative Jordan, along with other committee members, has studied the history of the 12 impeachments in the United States which have been voted by the House and sent to the Senate and of the four convictions all of which involved federal judges. The committee has even printed a 718-page book of selected readings on impeachment (this book, House Document No. 93-7, may be requested from one's representative in Congress).

DISAGREEMENT WITH AIDES

President Nixon has narrowly defined impeachable offenses as crimes of "a very serious nature," while the Judiciary Committee has settled for the broader definition of including activities other than criminal misconduct. The only two convictions in the 20th century suggest that the broad definition is more powerful.

Representative Jordan agrees with the broad view of the committee.

While noting that White House aides have said that under the broad definition all strong persistents could have been impeached, she said, "Well, I don't agree with that. The broad definition talks about neglect of duty, and subversion of the system of government, and I would find it difficult to believe that every president falls in that category.

"I don't know that Mr. Nixon falls in that category. All I know is that if we read the background of the words in the impeachment provision of the Constitution ['treason, bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors'] and read the considerations which the framers had in mind, we would begin then to feel they were concerned that the people had some redress of their grievances—if they had grievances—before an election occurred. I think that is what they were trying to do, and I think that is why impeachment is there."

Known as a liberal, Representative Jordan calls herself a "progressive liberal" because she says that all liberals are not progressive.

Representative Jordan, who graduated from Texas Southern University in Houston, got her law degree—and something of a New England accent—at Boston University Law School.

Although she realizes much of the country is confused at this time, she states simply that she is not.

PRIORITY QUESTION

"First, everybody ought to regret 'the Watergate' and all that word has come to mean. Nobody ought to take comfort in what we are going through in terms of investigations and indictments and trials. One should regret

that it happened—then try to find out why. What is it about the American political system which allowed this kind of event to occur? If you find out what it is which allowed it, then maybe we can prevent it in the future."

She added, "it ought to be an opportunity for a cleansing experience, for the political process, and I view it that way." She divided the word "cleansing" into two distinct syllables.

"If we don't find out why it happened and how it happened and try to change it—whatever it is—then we leave ourselves open for its recurrence in terms of the law, the system, campaign tactics, and political rules of operation. And that's what I'm talking about. I'm not talking about 'who went to the door and unlocked it, or broke in?' I'll let the police reports deal with that. But what I want to know is what is it in the political system that was so soft that this kind of an event could occur."

Has she reached any conclusions?

"It is not over. It is too early for conclusions. We just had Mr. Jaworski, the special prosecutor, saying he finally has the whole story. It is going to take a while for us to get the whole picture."

Although Representative Jordan has been described as having a judicious temperament, "she would never say to friends over dinner that she thinks the President is guilty or not," said Robert Cochran, former chief editorial writer for the Houston Chronicle, who met her in the early 1960's before she went into politics.

Representative Jordan has a clean record of sticking by her beliefs, yet being able to gather friends and admirers from the most conservative of legislators and voters. About the only criticism one hears is that she is "short on small talk" or "doesn't have a very quick sense of humor."

Mr. Cochran recalls speaking—along with Barbara Jordan—at a meeting of white "biased" suburbanite women in the early 1960's. He said that afterward the women were so impressed with her, they were swarming around her like bees.

"I first ran for office in 1962," Representative Jordan has said. "I lost, but I got 46,000 votes. I figured that anybody who gets 46,000 people to vote for them for any office should keep on trying."

She lost again in 1964, but won a seat with the state Senate in 1966.

Said Mr. Cochran:

"If one wanted to think up the three handicaps with which one could enter a know-nothing, reactionary state Senate of those days, it would be a person of liberal persuasion, a woman, and a black. Yet, her intelligence and her commanding personality got her to the point where she had the state Senate eating out of her hand."

She was named outstanding freshman Texas senator in her first year. She became president pro-tem of the Texas Senate and won governor-for-a-day when the governor and lieutenant governor who were out of the state. (Her father, a minister who had put his three daughters through college by working in a warehouse, was in Austin for the occasion. He passed on the next day.)

"The Senate has changed, and it will not revert regarding black people," declared state Senator Jordan.

NEWSPAPER PRAISE

When she went to the U.S. Congress in 1972, the conservative Houston Chronicle praised her as "an eloquent spokesman—perhaps the most effective in the state's history against human injustice."

Once in Congress, her first choice was the committee on the judiciary. She said she wanted to have a hand in legislation affecting the lives of minorities and noted that the committee handled bills dealing with civil rights and busing. Representative Jordan

does not refute the story that Lyndon B. Johnson helped get her this committee position. (Noted Mr. Cochran, who was a speech writer for former President Johnson, "She was the sort of person Johnson hoped would come up here from Texas, and she did.")

Representative Jordan, who now returns to Houston every other weekend, has noted, "Politics is all consuming, almost totally consuming. I definitely do not discount marriage, but a good marriage requires that one attend to it and not treat it as another hobby."

Once again, Representative Jordan is having no trouble finding friends among conservative colleagues.

RARICK COMMENTS

Rep. John R. Rarick (D) of Louisiana has been heard to say, "Barbara Jordan is the best congressman Texas has got." When asked about Representative Jordan, Representative Rarick fumbled the word "congresswoman." He explained that he didn't feel she acted like a woman, a black, or a liberal. "She acts like a representative in Congress," he finally said.

Has she ever changed his mind on an issue?

"No," he said. "Nor do I believe I've ever changed her mind."

What is it that enables her to get along with so many different people?

"I don't know," said Representative Jordan. "I've thought about that from time to time. If I could capsuleize what it is that helps me to get along with people who are totally opposite to me in terms of point of view, I would package and bottle and sell it—because apparently it would go well. It would be a good product." She smiled and almost laughed at the thought.

"My approach is to respect the humanity of everybody—no matter who they are or how they think or how they feel. Their position on anything is not relevant to the way I can relate to them as a human being. That we have in common."

For the first six months of Congress, Representative Jordan (who was present for 99 percent of all roll-call votes) scored "100" on polls rated by the AFL-CIO and the League of Women Voters, and "92" by the Americans for Democratic Action.

She didn't vote to score, she said. "It came down to a matter. 'Is this a position I believe in?' and would it be representative of the people who elected me to represent them?"

Although she is not a flag waver, Representative Jordan said, "Whatever I do, I'm a woman, and so it helps the movement. But I don't participate in the activist part of the feminist movement."

Along with Rep. Martha W. Griffiths (D) of Michigan she sponsored a bill this year which would provide social security for housewives.

"The reaction to that bill has been overwhelming through this country. I have gotten letters from east and west, north and south, from women and men and universities and sociologists saying, 'At last, this kind of legislation has been introduced.' And if people get that kind of discussion going we'll get that bill passed one day."

RUFFLING OF FEATHERS

Representative Jordan ruffled the feathers of some black congressmen when she announced her second month in Congress that she felt the black political caucus had one function—legislation. She said then, "Fifteen members of Congress who are black have a commonality of issues—blackness. But this can't do what the other organizations have been designed to do throughout the years. We are legislators, and we ought to remember that this is our role."

"In the future," she said, "I don't think we will see much in terms of legislation with

regard to civil rights. I think blacks have begun to recognize that our future is in the political process and that the gains will be made there. It is very tough. It is not a very sexy way to proceed in civil rights, but it is now an accepted, legitimate way to achieve gains for black people, and I think this is what we are going to see more and more."

When asked if she was supporting fellow Democrat Frances T. (Sissy) Farenthold for governor in Texas, she curtly replied.

"I'm not supporting anybody for any race except Barbara Jordan for re-election to Congress. . . . I have a rule of thumb. When I am a candidate and I am on the ballot I stick to my own campaign. And I think that rule of thumb has served me well."

HARVEY DUEHOLM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, often over the last 2 years Members of Congress have heard me or Senator GAYLORD NELSON tell "Dueholm" stories to illustrate a point. Those stories, which almost always make a point far more effectively than hours of sonorous debate, are the product of Wisconsin State Representative Harvey Dueholm.

Harvey Dueholm has a greater sense of humor and a greater sense of commitment than almost any legislator I have ever known. Since I first went to the Wisconsin Legislature in 1963 it has been obvious to me that Harvey Dueholm has been the conscience of the Democratic caucus—and even Democrats need a reminder from their conscience once in a while.

Harvey Dueholm represents Polk and Burnett Counties in northwestern Wisconsin. That is beautiful country but it is far from wealthy in economic terms. Harvey reflects the country he comes from. He never forgets that those who most need help from any legislator—on the Federal or State level—are the poor, the middle income, the struggling small farmer, the small mainstreet businessman trying to compete in an era of growing bigness.

That knowledge shows through in Harvey Dueholm's votes on taxes, education, health and social programs, and almost everything else. He genuinely loves people and does his level best to translate that love into sensible government action to get at the problems of the people who most need attention.

Recently, to my delight, the Madison Capital Times ran a story about Harvey Dueholm. It is not long, but Harvey's salt, his irreverence and his integrity show through and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

DUEHOLM: NEARLY LAST OF HIS KIND

(By Arthur L. Srb)

Wisconsin is known as the Dairy State, but the number of farmers in her legislative halls may have reached and all-time low.

Rep. Harvey Dueholm (D-Luck) fights his legislative battles on the same Assembly floor his father, Marius, did 40 years ago.